

1 DANIEL L. WARSHAW (Bar No. 185365)  
2 dwarshaw@pswlaw.com  
3 BOBBY POUYA (Bar No. 245527)  
4 bpouya@pswlaw.com  
5 MATTHEW A. PEARSON (Bar No. 291484)  
6 mapearson@pswlaw.com  
7 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**  
8 15165 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 400  
9 Sherman Oaks, California 91403  
10 Telephone: (818) 788-8300  
11 Facsimile: (818) 788-8104  
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff James Eashoo,  
13 individually and on behalf of all others  
14 similarly situated

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JAMES EASHOO, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

IOVATE HEALTH SCIENCES U.S.A.,  
INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:15-cv-01726-BRO-PJW

**CLASS ACTION**

**DECLARATION OF DANIEL L.  
WARSHAW IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF  
PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW,  
LLP AS INTERIM LEAD  
COUNSEL**

(Assigned to the Honorable Beverly  
Reid O'Connell)

Date: May 18, 2015  
Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Crtrm.: 14

1 I, Daniel L. Warshaw, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly admitted to practice before this Court. I am a  
3 partner in the firm of Pearson, Simon & Warshaw, LLP (“PSW”), attorneys of  
4 record for Plaintiff James Eashoo in the above entitled action against Defendant  
5 Iovate Health Sciences U.S.A., Inc. (“Iovate”).

6 2. I submit this declaration in support of the Motion for Appointment of  
7 PSW as Interim Lead Class-Counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
8 23(g).

9 3. I am the attorney principally responsible for the handling of this matter.  
10 I am personally familiar with the facts set forth in this declaration. If called as a  
11 witness, I could and would competently testify to the matters stated herein.

12 **Factual and Procedural History of the *Eashoo* Action**

13 4. PSW filed the *Eashoo* action on March 10, 2015. The *Eashoo* action  
14 alleges that Defendant Iovate has violated various consumer protection and warranty  
15 laws by misrepresenting the amount of protein contained in its protein supplements  
16 sold under various brand names including, MuscleTech, Six Star, Sam’s Club,  
17 fuel:one, and EPIQ. Specifically, the *Eashoo* action alleges that Iovate has engaged  
18 in a practice commonly known as “protein spiking,” whereby Defendant’s protein  
19 supplement are “spiked” with amino acids and other non-protein additives which  
20 falsely register as proteins when tested under certain methods.

21 5. Prior to filing the *Eashoo* action, PSW conducted a detailed  
22 independent investigation and analysis into the relevant facts, legal theories, and  
23 claims in this class action lawsuit. The *Eashoo* action was filed only after PSW  
24 conducted this independent investigation and analysis, which included independent  
25 testing and analysis of specific products to support the allegations of the complaint.

26 6. It is my understanding that the *Eashoo* action filed by PSW was the  
27 first of its kind filed against Iovate in the United States.

1       7. After filing the *Eashoo* action, I became aware that a nearly identical  
 2 action, entitled *McKenzie v. Iovate Health Sciences U.S.A., Inc. et. al.*, 1:15-cv-  
 3 0643, was filed in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado on  
 4 March 27, 2015. Although, the *McKenzie* action involves only one product, the core  
 5 allegations in *McKenzie* are identical to *Eashoo*. Like *Eashoo*, the *McKenzie* case  
 6 alleges that the Epiq Isolate Protein Powder manufactured by Iovate is “spiked”  
 7 with additional and unnecessary free-form amino acids, non-protein amino acids,  
 8 and a litany of other non-protein ingredients.” Like *Eashoo*, the *McKenzie* action  
 9 alleges that the inclusion of these non-protein ingredients resulted in the elevation or  
 10 “spiking” of the protein levels in Epiq Isolate Protein Powder. Like *Eashoo*, the  
 11 *McKenzie* action seeks reimbursement of the purchase price and injunctive relief on  
 12 behalf of consumers who purchased Epiq Isolate Protein Powder. Thus, the later  
 13 filed *McKenzie* is predicated and tracks the allegations of the *Eashoo* action. (See  
 14 *McKenzie* Complaint, attached to April 16, 2015 letter from *McKenzie* counsel  
 15 attached hereto as Ex. “D”).

16       8. On April 10, 2015, counsel for Iovate, Scott Ferrell of Newport Trial  
 17 Group, sent a letter to counsel for *McKenzie*, Timothy Fisher of Burson & Fisher,  
 18 stating Iovate’s intent to seek a stay in the *McKenzie* case, pursuant to the pendency  
 19 of the first filed *Eashoo* action. A true and correct copy of this letter is attached  
 20 hereto as Ex. “C.”

21       9. On April 16, 2015, Mr. Fisher sent a letter to Mr. Ferrell and me,  
 22 stating that he intended to file a motion to intervene in the *Eashoo* action. A true  
 23 and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Ex. “D.”

24       10. Since filing the *Eashoo* action, PSW has made substantial progress in  
 25 the litigation and made significant efforts to protect the interests of the putative class  
 26 members. PSW’s efforts have included, but are not limited to, negotiating a  
 27 stipulated waiver of Local Rule 23-3, negotiating a Stipulated Protective Order,  
 28 exchanging Rule 26 initial disclosures, and initiating discovery against Iovate. If

1 PSW is appointed as interim lead counsel, it will continue to protect and serve the  
 2 interest of the class members.

3       11. I believe that the intervention by *McKenzie* in this action has the  
 4 potential to impede this progress and may be detrimental to the interests of the  
 5 putative class members. The appointment of PSW as interim lead class counsel is  
 6 appropriate and necessary to ensure the efficient handling of this matter and protect  
 7 the interest of the class members.

8       12. Prior to filing Plaintiff's Motion for Interim Lead Counsel, I conferred  
 9 with counsel for Iovate, Scott Ferrell, pursuant to Local Rule 7-3. Mr. Ferrell has  
 10 advised me that Iovate does not oppose PSW's Motion for Interim Lead Counsel.

11       **PSW's Experience and Qualifications to Serve as Lead Counsel**

12       13. The attorneys at PSW have extensive experience in complex litigation  
 13 and class actions. PSW has represented a wide range of clients in complex litigation  
 14 and class actions and have obtained over ***one billion*** dollars in settlements and  
 15 verdicts on behalf of their clients. PSW currently serves, or has served, as lead  
 16 counsel in some of the most advanced, cutting-edge, class actions in the country  
 17 including, but not limited to: *In re Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Litigation*, MDL  
 18 No. 2476 (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No.  
 19 2420 (N.D. Cal.); *In re Carrier IQ Consumer Privacy Litigation*, MDL No. 2330  
 20 (N.D. Cal.); *In re Warner Music Group Corp. Digital Downloads Litigation*, No.  
 21 CV 12-0559 (N.D. Cal.); *Sciortino, et al. v. PepsiCo, Inc.*, No. 14-cv-478 (N.D.  
 22 Cal.); *Senne v. Office of the Commissioner of Baseball et al.*, No. 3:14-cv-00608  
 23 (N.D. Cal.); and *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation*, No. 07-md-08127  
 24 (N.D. Cal.).

25       14. A complete profile of PSW's attorneys and a summary of the numerous  
 26 complex litigation matters in which they have obtained successful results is set for  
 27 in PSW's firm resume attached hereto as Ex. "A."

28

1       15. I have personally held a lead role in many of these cases, including but  
2 not limited to: *In re Carrier IQ, Inc. Consumer Privacy Litigation*, No. C-12-md-  
3 2330-EMC (N.D. Cal.), nationwide class action alleging that mobile phone  
4 diagnostics company, Carrier IQ, Inc, and numerous mobile phone manufacturers,  
5 improperly intercepted consumer information in violation of state and federal law;  
6 *Wolph v. Acer America Corp.*, No. C 09-1314 (N.D. Cal.), a nationally certified  
7 class action involving defective Acer computers that resulted in a classwide  
8 settlement; *In re Warner Music Group Corp. Digital Downloads Litigation*, No. CV  
9 12-559-RS (N.D. Cal.) and *James v. UMG Recordings, Inc.*, No. CV 11-1613-SI  
10 (N.D. Cal.), cases involving allegations of underpaid royalties to recording artists  
11 and producers for digital downloads of their music; *Nasseri v. CytoSport, Inc.*, No.  
12 BC439181 (L.A. Super. Ct.), class action involving claims that CytoSport, Inc.  
13 failed to adequately disclose the amount of lead, mercury and arsenic contained in  
14 its protein supplements in violation of Proposition 65 and state consumer statutes;  
15 and *Sciortino, et al. v. PepsiCo, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-478 (N.D. Cal.) class action  
16 alleging that Pepsi beverages contained elevated levels of the chemical 4-  
17 Methylimidazole (“4-MEI”) in violation of Proposition 65 and state consumer  
18 statutes.

19       16. My experience in *Nasseri* and *Sciortino* are particularly valuable to this  
20 case and demonstrative of the ability myself and the attorneys of PSW to serve as  
21 interim lead counsel in a consumer class action lawsuit challenging  
22 misrepresentations on food and supplement products.

23       17. *Nasseri* was a nationwide class arising from CytoSport, Inc.’s  
24 misrepresentations regarding the qualities characteristics and benefits of its protein  
25 products, including Muscle Milk and Monster Milk. Plaintiffs alleged that the these  
26 products contained elevated levels lead, cadmium, and/or arsenic in violation of  
27 Proposition 65 and consumer protection statutes. The *Nasseri* case resulted in a  
28

1 nationwide settlement which required the Defendant to reformulate its protein  
 2 supplements to comply with the law and provide financial relief to consumers.

3       18. In appointing PSW as co-lead counsel after a contested lead counsel  
 4 motion in *Sciortino*, the Honorable Edward M. Chen of the Northern District of  
 5 California stated:

6           “PSW [ ] has extensive experience with complex class  
 7 action litigation, including trial experience. PSW [ ] have  
 8 demonstrated specific expertise in Proposition-65-related  
 9 litigation and have shown the ability and willingness to  
 10 commit resources to prosecuting this action. The majority  
 11 of the other plaintiffs’ firms involved in this action have  
 12 expressed their confidence in PSW [ ] abilities to fairly  
 13 and adequately represent the class.”

14       See *Sciortino* Order Consolidating Cases and Appointing Lead Counsel (*Sciortino*  
 15 Dkt. No. 65), Warshaw Decl., Ex. “B.”

16       19. PSW has demonstrated its commitment to protect the class members in  
 17 other significant matters, including *TFT-LCD*, in which my firm undertook  
 18 tremendous risk and expense in prosecuting a large antitrust class action over a  
 19 period of more than five years. Under the co-leadership of my firm and Lieff,  
 20 Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, we managed over 50 firms that had filed  
 21 direct purchaser cases. I personally helped manage discovery of nearly 8 million  
 22 documents consisting of over 40 million pages, and oversaw as many as 136  
 23 document reviewers working concurrently. The direct purchaser class served 184  
 24 sets of discovery requests and three written depositions, responded to 75 sets of  
 25 requests propounded by defendants, and engaged in extensive discovery motion  
 26 practice before a special master. Counsel took and defended more than 130  
 27 depositions: 50 in San Francisco, 40 elsewhere across the country, and 41 outside of  
 28 the United States. In all, counsel for the direct purchaser plaintiffs incurred in  
 excess of \$11 million in costs, and contributed well over 250,000 hours of work on

1 the case including conducting a seven week jury trial which resulted in a verdict for  
2 plaintiffs.

3        20. PSW has demonstrated similar zealous and determined advocacy on  
4 behalf of the class members in all of the cases in which it has been appointed lead or  
5 served as class counsel. PSW is ready, willing and able to commit the time and  
6 resources necessary to serve as interim lead class counsel in this case.

7 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of  
8 America that the foregoing is true and correct.

**9** Executed on April 20, 2015, at Sherman Oaks, California.

/s/ Daniel L. Warshaw  
DANIEL L. WARSHAW

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP  
15165 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 400  
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91403